

## REMARKS

Figure 3 was objected to because it was darkened to the point that the details of the invention appeared to be unclear. In response, a lightened drawing that is identical to the Figure 3 originally filed was filed in the last office action response. Please call the Attorney of Record should that figure not be deemed light enough so that a higher quality copy can be hand delivered to the Patent Office, if necessary.

Claims 3 and 4 were objected to for informalities, and have been corrected per the Examiner's suggestion. Applicant regrets the typo and thanks the Examiner for catching the mistyping.

Claims 1, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because claim 1 defines a seat having at least one connection member communicating with both the forward portions of the first and second members as well as the rearward portions of the first and second members. Also, claims 19 and 20 define first and second members disposed in different horizontal planes, yet the spec does not disclose the horizontal positioning of the first and second members. In response, claim 1 has been amended to read "two connection members." Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite because the phrase "said seat rail is generally 'U' shaped, such that the bottom of the 'U' shape is under said first rearward portion and said second portion" was unclear. In response, claim 10 has been canceled.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 872,124 to Hammaren. In response, Applicant has amended all independent claims (claims 1 and 8) to reflect that the present invention has a first forward portion and a second forward portion that can be disposed apart, but also together without any forward gap therebetween. This distinction is shown in the figures as originally filed with the application, as well as in the Detailed Description corresponding to Figure 1 and the Summary of the Invention, and is not present or suggested by the relevant art. Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims are now allowable as the amendments to claims 1 and 8 affect all dependent claims as well.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,209,954 B1 to Bombardier. Applicant respectfully asserts that the aforementioned amendments now distinguish the present invention for the aforementioned reasons, and thus, the claims are now allowable since the amendments to claims 1 and 8 affect all dependent claims as well.

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammaren in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,290,291 B1 to Kojima. Applicant respectfully asserts that the aforementioned amendments now distinguish the present invention for the aforementioned reasons, since claims 5 and 12 ultimately depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively. Applicant believes the claims to now be allowable.


*Please charge all fees due and owing to Deposit Account No. 500356 in the name of Greenberg & Lieberman. A petition for extension of time is hereby made.*

The Examiner is encouraged to call Attorney of Record, Michael L. Greenberg, at 301-588-8393 should there be any further questions or concerns regarding the present application. *If the claims are not deemed allowable, Attorney of Record kindly requests*

*an interview prior to the mailing of any office action.*

**CERTIFICATION OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this amendment and response was sent via US fax 1-703-308-6906 to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 3, 2004.



Michael L. Greenberg, Esq.

Reg. No. 47312

Dated 6-3-04